UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,721	10/28/2003	Jerrel C. Anderson	AD7065 USNA	5537
20700	7590 02/26/200 DE NEMOURS AND	EXAMINER		
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER			NAKARANI, DHIRAJLAL S	
BARLEY MIL 4417 LANCAS	L PLAZA 25/1128 STER PIKE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WILMINGTON			1773	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/695,721	ANDERSON, JERREL C.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	D. S. Nakarani	1773			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDO	ON.  timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18	December 2006.				
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 11-43 is/are pending in the application	on.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 34-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-33 and 41-43</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)	_				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date.					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/2007.</li> </ul>	5)  Notice of Inform 6)  Other:				

Art Unit: 1773

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 2. Claims 34-40 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 19, 2005.
- 3. The Examiner interprets embodiments claims 28-31 as follows:

Embodiment of claim 28: A/B/A/I/G

Embodiment of claim 29: G/A/B/A/I/G

Embodiment of claim 30: G/A/B/A/I/G and

Embodiment of claim 31: G/A/B/A/I/G

Wherein A: represents thermoplastic polymer sheet (Claimed ionomer sheet), B: represents film, which either reflect or absorb IR light, G: represents glass layer and I: represents a layer of transparent interlayer material (claim 28), layer of polyvinyl butyral (claim 29) or plasticized polyvinyl butyral (claims 30 and 31).

If the Examiner is incorrect in his interpretation, applicant is requested to specify correct embodiment of the above claims. The following rejection is based on the above interpretation.

**Art Unit: 1773** 

- 4. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the layer of transparent plasticized interlayer (Page for lines 17-18), does not reasonably provide enablement for either at least one layer of transparent interlayer material (Claim 28) or at least one layer of polyvinyl butyral (Claim 29). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. As per page 4, lines 8-13, the unplasticized PVB is not suitable for use in glazing due to properties such as high modulus and low tensile strength. The inventions as claimed in claims 28 and 29 read on unplasticized transparent interlayer material such as unplasticized PVB. Thus inventions as claimed in claims 28 and 29 are broader in scope than disclosed in the instant disclosure.
- 5. Claims 30 and 31 are duplicate claims as per above interpretation.
- 6. Claims 11-33 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11 and 33, line 9, the phrase "ethylene/ $\alpha$ - $\beta$ -unsaturated copolymer ionomer" renders claims indefinite. It is not clear from claim language whether applicant is trying to claim "ethylene/ $\alpha$ - $\beta$ -unsaturated copolymer ionomer" or "ethylene/ $\alpha$ - $\beta$ -

Art Unit: 1773

unsaturated carboxylic acid copolymer ionomer". Clarification and/or correction requested.

- 7. Claims 11-27, 32, 33, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost et al (U. S. Patent 5,932,329) in view of Bolton et al (U.S. Patent 4,668,574) with, as an evidence, Swofford (U. S. Patent 5,082,738) for the reasons of record set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action mailed July 19, 2006 (Paper Number 20060710).
- 8. Claims 28-31 and 41 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs, set forth in this Office action.
- 9. Receipt of Information Disclosure Statement filed January 18, 2007 is acknowledged and all recited documents have been made of record.
- 10. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In reference to rejection of claims 11-27, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost et al (U. S. Patent 5,932,329) in view of Bolton et al (U.S. Patent 4,668,574) with, as an evidence, Swofford (U. S. Patent 5,082,738), applicant mainly argues that Frost et al describe a laminate of a film with IR reflecting coating sandwiched between two thermoplastic polyurethane and/or polyvinyl butyral layers. Support films for IR reflecting coating includes polyethylene

Art Unit: 1773

terephthalate. Frost et al describe that distortion experienced in the past with these types of laminate is reduced or eliminated if the thermoplastic polyurethane and/or polyvinyl butyral sheet on one side is at most 50 microns thick. Applicant further argues that Bolton et al describe ionomer resins, films and sheets for laminated articles and points to three types of structures shown in various figures. Applicant points to Figures 10 and 13. However there are no such figures described by Bolton et al. In addition applicant states that Swofford describes use of silane coupling agent to improve the bonding properties of polyester films and polyvinylbutyral, polycarbonate, polyurethane, polyolefines and similar films. Swofford also describes use of primer coating to enhance adhesion between ionomer and glass or polycarbonate.

These arguments are unpersuasive because Frost et al do not teach that the distortion experienced in the past with these types of laminate is reduced or eliminated if the thermoplastic polyurethane and/or polyvinyl butyral sheet is used. Frost et al clearly teach any of the adhesive material known from normal laminated glass can be considered for the adhesive layer (Col. 3, lines 21-28). Frost et al eliminated problem of distortion by using one thin adhesive layer and other thicker adhesive layer. Bolton et al teach ionomer as an adhesive to eliminate problem associated with polyvinyl butyral adhesive and polyurethane adhesive. Swofford reference is used as an evidence showing Bolton et al's silane Z-6020 is an amino silane same as claimed in the present invention. Further more Swofford also discloses that the primed polyester film can be same as used by Frost et al and by Bolton et al (Col. 6, lines 20-32).

Art Unit: 1773

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. S. Nakarani whose telephone number is (571) 272-1512. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

D. S. Nakarani Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

DSN February 22, 2007.